M 1408

Wednesday, May 22, 1968

Group III

(Lunch)

MR. NYLAND: It's all set? Okay, fine. How many?

Answer: Two.

MR. NYLAND: Yah. Good.

Last week, of course, I wasn't here and you had a meeting. I listened to it and there were a couple of questions perhaps. What was it? Was it Patrick talking about light and dark? Patrick, was that that meeting?

Patrick: Yah.

MR. NYLAND: Was that--Was it clarified? Was it clarified?

Patrick: I'm still...

MR. NYLAND: And you're satisfied? No more questions about light and dark? Good.

What other questions are there? What will we talk about today?

First Questioner: I have a question. I was watching the Krishnamurti program last week and he was talking about the observed and the observer becoming one. And what I'd done, while I was watching the television, I blocked out all thoughts whatsoever and just... And I wouldn't say that I became one with the television set, but I just saw that his face was the whole thing that was going on in my mind and that was all, and there were no other

thoughts. And then I become confused with that sensation. I did the same thing with my cat, what I sometimes do ( ) person and I don't know what I'm doing.

MR. MYLAND: You'd better be careful now...

Questioner: I become confused when I observe because now when I say I look at my foot and I know it's a foot, then I just blank. I have no thoughts and I consider that impartiality, no judgments, no nothing, I just look at them, I forget it's just a foot, I just stare.

MR. MYLAND: What does it lead you to?

Questioner: It leads me to nothing. It's very pleasant.

MR. MYLAND: Oh, is it? I think it is unpleasant.

Questioner: I mean, it's pleasant in the sense that it's very relaxing. It doesn't do anything for me but it just sort of - like, you know.

MR. MYLAND: All right. Then use it for that. It's all right.

Questioner: But now I've become confused.

MR. MYLAND: As long as you don't want to call it Work.

Questioner: No, I don't. Now I want to get my mind straight. ( ) confused.

MR. MYLAND: Why, what do you want to get straight now?

Questioner: Because I don't consider that Work.

MR. MYLAND: Good. I don't either.

Questioner: And I'm confusing it now with Work experiences.

MR. MYLAND: Why, if you know it isn't?

Questioner: Because if I just stare at something and--or I become aware of my hand, say, and I don't have any thoughts about it and don't make any judgments and just notice that there's a hand...

MR. MYLAND: Okay. So what?

Questioner: That even thought I know, I think it's Work now.

MR. MYLAND: It's what?

Questioner: Work.

MR. HYLAND: You think that's Work?

Questioner: I think that's observation.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, it may be.

Questioner: You once said-- I brought up an experience and you said that was it. And now I'm confusing it. Maybe it's just that I'm doing it all wrong and I'm just associating with what Krishnamurti had to say. And it wasn't ( ) anyway, ( ) sort of doing it all along anyway. I'm confused.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, I'm so confused now that I don't know what you're talking about. You're mixing things up a little bit. That it's first Krishnamurti and then television set, and your hand and your foot. Then you come close to me and then you go away again. What is happening?

Questioner: I know I'm not having any thoughts of what I'm doing or saying, I'm not making any judgments.

MR. HYLAND: I think you're a little bit too narrow about not having any thoughts. I think there is a section in the brain that actually could become observant. And then there is a mental process going on which we call awareness. And that what is recording you as you are, is recorded by something we call an objective faculty. And when that starts to function, it is a mental process of recording. But the rest of your brain continues. It may be reduced because it may not receive much energy, but I'm quite certain that your eyes or your hearing or all the rest is still functioning. And for that you use your brain because you get constantly images or something as an object that you see or perceive in some way or other. It's recorded in your brain so your brain is still active. Most likely it will produce a little less thought and perhaps less association, but you cannot say that you're not thinking.

I think it's utterly impossible not to think. But it's very good if

a certain section of your brain can become aware and then have a certain mental function which is different from an ordinary thought process. But I think you make it much too confused, and Krishnamurti doesn't seem to help you. Even if he uses the word observation, that there's something very good in that. When he says that what is observed and the observer becoming one, it's another way of saying that it happens at the moment, in which there is a totality of that what is object and that what is an observer are actually not separated in any matter of space or time. So it's his way...

What is noisy in the back? (Interruption)

You understand something about Work? You understand that that staring is a very good way of Working?

Questioner: No.

MR. NYLAND: You don't?

Questioner: I'd like it to be.

MR. NYLAND: Yah, but you have to become active about staring.

Questioner: I think that's the conclusion that I came to.

MR. NYLAND: And in order to eliminate the confusion, you have to stick to very simple things and not try to mix it up. What is needed in observing of course is in the first place a recording, in the second place an impartiality, and in the third place, simultaneity. What Krishnamurti emphasizes is the question of a moment, an instant. That is a division between future and past and we call it present. And whenever anything is recorded in the present, your ordinary functioning of mind or feeling stops regarding that what is being observed. They continue as far as the rest of the world is concerned. But there is a relationship between an observer or an objective faculty, and that what is being observed by him. And if it happens to be the little 'I' doing this, there is a relation between the little 'I' and the object of observation. And it may be that you are the

object of observation. It is right.

Questioner: When I have the little 'I' outside of me looking down, I'm okay. When I have it inside...

MR. MYLAND: Well, don't let's now confuse it because the little 'I' is not outside.

Questioner: I know, but symbolically. I mean...

MR. MYLAND: Whatever it is, symbolically, it's not there now. We're talking about your brain, and we're talking about the thought processes in your brain which you say stop. They go on but you don't pay attention to it, so you don't register them. Now if I stare, I use the same kind of a method of eliminating out of my vision different things that otherwise would be recorded. But the staring now means that something can remain active. When I stare at an object, I can have then that image of the object recorded in me. This I call active staring. It is not passive, it is an activity. And in that way I establish a relationship between part of my brain and that what I'm looking at, staring at, and then making this image, that I realize that what I'm looking at exists. Then it becomes an objective fact for me, because I can look at it without having any further thoughts about it.

But try to simply, if you want to Work, try to do it when you are in a very ordinary sense active, walking up and down and no more than that. And then see if there is something like the little 'I' which can remain observant of you, and don't determine that it is outside of you or inside or somewhere. Something in you becomes observant of that what is taking place. And that's all you try to do. And you walk up and down. You're not going to explain it any further and you're not going to think anymore about it, than just observing during the time that you have that form of energy or that kind of a wish. And for the rest, let it go. Don't philosophize about it. Never mind how it goes, where it is, how strong this or

that. It's all nonsense and it leads to confusion, and including this idea of having an image come towards you and so forth. It's very nice as an illustration, but it is really quite useless. Moreover, it's quite wrong in a certain way because it doesn't include impartiality. And impartiality in Work is one of the most important facts and it has to be observed.

All right? Does it clear it up now? From now on clear sailing. Okay? Good.

Yah.

Second Questioner: How can you know if you're really awake?

MR. NYLAND: Well, what is the difference when you wake up out of a physical sleep and you open your eyes and there is the rest of the world and you look at it. How do you know you're awake?

Questioner: I can see.

MR. NYLAND: Yah, that's it. So how do I know when I'm consciously awake? That I have a very definite taste of a state which I recognise and then I call it being awake. I can describe it in a certain way, that I will be able to function as if there is much more light and not the darkness Patrick is talking about, that there is a difference between that kind of an unconscious state in my daily life when it is more like a dream. But when I actually wake up, I have a realization that I exist. And this existence for myself is something that I usually don't experience, because I know in memory that I have existed. And the thoughts about that what I have done is quite clear in my mind. But when I wake up, it is as if something actually is added to my existence which gives me, at that time, a realization that I, this person, is existing. We call it awakening because there is a difference between the unconscious and the conscious state. But in the beginning, there may be very little of something that is conscious as compared to what is unconscious. And after some time it gets a little bit more, but

for the beginning it is enough to indicate that there's a little difference, and I call it more light is shed on me and I am not as much in darkness.

If you want to compare it with an accidental moment of awakening, for which you're not responsible and which happened to come, one has a realization of existing in which that what is the ordinary personality doesn't seem to function. And what becomes very clear is this particular moment of a realization of existing in whatever situation may be there. And this accidental moment which we then call a moment I don't forget, is so strong that it is registered in me in a certain place quite differently from any kind of a memory. I think if you make an attempt, you will find, at a certain time, that you are awake - at least it is different. When you continue for six months, you will find moments that are a little bit better and more awake. And you will say that what I experienced before really was not awakening, but now I know what it is to be aware. And for the next ten years, it will go on like that. Don't expect to be conscious overnight, but at least there is a possibility of having something that is a little bit more conscious every once in a while.

Yah.

Jerry ( ): Mr. Nyland, during the last six months while in Spain, I came in contact with a number of people who were connected with the Sufi movement. I also read several books having to do with Sufi ideas and Sufi thought. And I found quite a strong parallel in many of the things that I read by Mr. Gurdjieff and about Mr. Gurdjieff. I was wondering how closely connected these ideas are in terms of...

MR. NYLAND: You know the little book called Teachers of Gurdjieff?

Jerry: Yes, I've read that.

MR. NYLAND: Well, it is entirely a Sufi approach. And in that it is claimed that Gurdjieff originally was in contact with Sufi and Sufi masters.

Jerry: Yes.

MR. NYLAND: You see?

Jerry: Well, I discount that as a book.

MR. NYLAND: Oh, no, I don't.

Jerry: I'm talking about the content of the ideas as expressed.

MR. NYLAND: I think there's a great similarity in it.

Jerry: Things like stop exercises.

MR. NYLAND: Well, that I think is not very strong. I think what a Sufi is a little bit weak on, is exactly the question of impartiality. I think, at least as far as I know, there is not enough explained of how to do that, than only through a road of meditation or being quiet or silent or things of that kind which of course are quite useful. For me, Sufism is not satisfactory enough in my daily life. It is very good to be separated from life and then experience certain states which are quite useful. And in that way, I think, it differs quite fundamentally from Gurdjieff. I would say that Gurdjieff based certain ideas, naturally living in the Near East, on a great deal of Sufi. And what Idries Shah is trying to prove, is that he is a continuation of Gurdjieff, more or less, or what Bennett is trying to advocate. But in reality it is a little hollow and there's not sufficiently perspective in it, or to put it on a sufficiently cosmological scale. And there is a great deal of difference in any book that is written by any Sufi and ALL AND EVERYTHING. There are similarities.

Jerry: Well, the idea that appealed to me was the attitude that one has towards life and not being, living - how will I explain it? - living in life but not being touched by it some way.

MR. NYLAND: I think that's right, but that's not only Sufi. That question of detachment you will find in all forms of Buddhism.

Jerry: It's as though one could see oneself going through life.

MR. MYLAND: Yah, the question is, how do I see it?

Jerry: Well, that's the moment of...

MR. MYLAND: If it's a moment of seeing it, it can be impartial. But if I recall it, I'm afraid I'm attached.

You see, it's quite right, there are many different ideas in any kind of a religion which are similar to others, and you can pick up something from Zen regarding a moment of existence. And the contemplation and meditation in accordance with either Buddhism or Sufism, or the idea of being in life and to realize that what is in life and that something of the outer life should not touch me, that I should live in my inner life and not be in contact. I can also get that in mysticism. There are a variety of religions that are very similar in certain respects. The question is for a person who's living in this particular age, what is needed for him to be able to live his life in life, and at the same time emphasize his inner life. That is really the problem.

Jerry: Well, what are the negative aspects like non-identification and non-involvement, in terms of sapping your energy and letting yourself go in specific life happenings that happen, to be able to contain yourself in relation to the experience.

MR. MYLAND: Ideally, of course, it doesn't make any difference under what condition I am in ordinary life. I still should be able to be conscious. If I exclude from my so-called religion all the difficulties that are in ordinary life, then of course the religion is not worth very much. It's only good on Sunday. You have to have som thing that is possible of application in any event, in any experience of my daily life. It does not mean that I can do it immediately, because in many instances I'm so tremendously involved that I cannot even think about Work. But it does not mean that if

I acquire a dexterity that gradually, with this, it will be possible to take off a bigger piece each time that I keep on working, depending entirely on how much this 'I' could grow. If it has that kind of perspective, it is quite different from the rest.

All right, Jerry?

Fourth Questioner: (What is impartiality?)

MR. NYLAND: Well, the question of impartiality is that you eliminate any kind of a feeling. Any kind of a feeling. When I want to have a true observation, I only want to use my intellect for a recording of a fact, and I don't want to describe it. I don't want to like it or dislike it. I don't want, in my intellect, any interference of a feeling regarding that what is being observed.

Questioner: If you are observing a feeling?

MR. NYLAND: No, I'm not observing a feeling. That is very difficult. Ultimately, I have hope. You see, the idea of observation means that something in me becomes actually in existence while that what is me as personality continues to live. And that that what is separated from me, being perhaps in my mind - and sometimes for the sake of illustrating objectivity, I say it is as if it is outside of me - is something that has to be in existence constantly so that that could function in a conscious way and my personality can continue to function unconsciously. Hoping that ultimately that what is conscious can then start to affect the condition of my unconscious. And because of that, that the unconscious ultimately could also become conscious.

Questioner: All of it?

MR. NYLAND: All of it. But the difficulty is that when I start to become observant and give the little 'I' a task to be the observer, that what is now observing has to function in accordance by being impartial and also to take place at the same time - that is, simultaneity - that that is very

difficult for something that just is starting out, you might say, on its own. When the little 'I' is still very small, it cannot cope with difficult conditions. So I make that what is being observed as simple as I can make it, and I select first ordinary forms of behavior of a physical kind. I take them because there is more chance that I become less and less involved in them, that I don't have to express a like or a dislike for them, and also that I become relatively free from associations. When I become less and less involved, when I'm more and more impartial, I eliminate the functions of my feelings. When I become less and less interested in associative forms or descriptions, I eliminate part of my brain. When I observe the physical body, I have a chance that that observation can result in just a registration of the existence of my body.

Questioner: Why do you object to feeling?

MR. NYLAND: I don't object to it, but when the little 'I' starts to become impartial to something that is completely partial, it has a hell of a time. It cannot do it. It's constantly affected by that what is being observed. And how can it be impartial about something that is partial, hundred percent? It's not that I don't want to do it, but the little 'I' has to grow up first until it's an instrument that actually can stand that, so that if I then shift to objective observation, the little 'I' can still function.

Questioner: But what if one is completely happy in life, should you still Work?

MR. NYLAND: Oh, I don't think so. I think when life is happy, it's fine. Why should I disturb it? I think this kind of Work is only for people who have problems, or who are a little mystically inclined, or who would like to put their religion on a certain basis of perspective.

Questioner: When one's in love, ( ) one's happy?

MR. NYLAND: I don't know what is happy or loved. I think one can feel it -

I think it's quite exceptional. And I think that even if one is in love and happy in the beginning, that after some time it also disappears.

Questioner: I'm not talking about in love ( ).

MR. HYLAND: Well, whatever it is. It started in love. And then it becomes love. And then after that it becomes monotony.

Questioner: I hope I never get to agree with you.

MR. HYLAND: No, I hope you won't. I'm only talking in generals.

Fifth Questioner: I was going to talk of my reaction of how it is very difficult to be in this state of love or happiness without being involved, and the other thing, which is little 'I' - I mean if it's not developed...

MR. HYLAND: No, the question is that when one loves, one loves only at certain times. One is all the time affected by every ordinary affair of ordinary life. I can withdraw, and in that state, love, without any doubt, and I can experience such moments. But when I eat and the food is not very good, I know that I can get angry, even if at other times I can be in a very loving state. And of course a person is a mixture of all kind of states. And therefore when I single out being in love, sure, it's wonderful as long as it lasts, but it doesn't last. And everybody knows it. If someone steps on my toes, I don't love him. But if someone gives me some candy, I ( ). You know, it's all right, but a person is a multitude of different aspects, and if I single out one and then I say that's me, I'm wrong. It isn't me at all. I happen to be sitting here in this chair, but it isn't me. Next moment I swear at a taxi when he overcharges me. That's also me. And when I fly off the handle, that's me. And when I'm very studious, I'm me. All different facets - I don't want to call them little I's because I think that is very confusing. But when I say facets, as if I look through different windows, and all the windows are different colors - that's the way I look at life. When I get up in the morning and I haven't had coffee, I'm nasty.

But when I have a lovely talk with so-and-so who says, You're marvelous, then I feel good, so I purr. You know, it is idiotic to single out just a couple of states and say that's me. That's not.

Questioner: Getting upset at the cabdriver, wouldn't there be - I mean, it's a matter of choice that the 'I' has in doing that particular - isn't that somehow involved in how you are in other ways too?

MR. NYLAND: Well, there is...

Questioner: If you can accept the fact that you will get upset at a cabdriver, whereas someone else might be too meek and only pay - that's them too - whereas someone might do something that...

MR. NYLAND: Well, in the first place, I'm not interested in how other people are. If they have their own problems, so have I. So I'm not comparing myself with what someone else is, although I may judge, you know. It is true - all possibilities are linked at any one time. But when I consider myself, what I would like or what I would like to become, then of course I have to look at myself, how I am in different states. Now sometimes I'm living on the surface and sometimes a little bit deeper. And I know that if I'm more essential, I'm less and less affected by that what is on the outside. So if I try to find how can I be all the time the same, theoretically I would have to move all the way to the inside of myself and not be affected by anything from the outside. The problem is, can I retain that what is within me and which is permanent and dependable, that that is also present when I have to pay the cabdriver? So it is a question of finding within oneself that kind of solidity which is undisturbed by that what affects me on the outside, and at the same time can be present when I'm involved in daily life. You see, then I have established something that is always me and that would be my real self. If that could be identified with an 'I', then this 'I', if it could function, it could be present and guide me at any

one time when my personality has to be engaged in ordinary life.

Questioner: If you're engaged with this argument with the cabdriver, you could still be aware of that as a conscious ( ).

MR. NYLAND: If you can be aware - and that is what we're talking about - it's logical that if that is possible, it would be very helpful.

Questioner: You could go through the motions of being angry...

MR. NYLAND: No, I don't think so.

Questioner: No? Without being affected by it?

MR. NYLAND: I think it's possible, but I don't think that it is so easily done.

Questioner: Is it desirable?

MR. NYLAND: The question is what I wish. If I want to lose my energy in outside manifestations, I'm perfectly allowed to do it. It may tire me out a little bit, but it might also make me (stop). If at the same time that I can engage in manifestations of the outside world, and also know that I'm really not touched, I may value that more than the loss of energy to the outside world. It depends on one's definition. I would like to have for myself something that I can rely on. For that I know I cannot live all the time on the outside world, because I'm affected by it and I turn myself in reflexes or in reactions to that what starts to affect me. And sometimes it takes all of me and there is nothing for me left to Work with, until I wait until that has lost its power and I come again to myself.

If I want to become a man on whom anyone can rely, that I myself can be at any one time like I wish to be, and not disturbed by the curcumstances - with other words, if I have a rudder that actually can steer me. But the condition in which I am, is like a ship without a rudder and I'm subject to all kind of currents from the wind or the sea or whatever waves that affect me. And that I must know for myself because I should not be foolish

to assume that I'm always the same. I'm not the same.

Questioner: What part does will power play?

MR. NYLAND: Will power is the result of consciousness and conscience. It's of a different kind of a level where we use the word Work. The rest is wish, inclinations, desires, and they belong to the different parts of a personality, and it may be his body, it may be his feelings, it may be his mind. It's a fairly low level, but it is a level which belongs to Earth, and it is an unconscious level as far as we are concerned, judging in comparison between that what is a wish - and even if it's a good wish, and even if it's a holy wish, it's not the same as will. Will is an execution of that what I know to be right with the power that I know comes from the right place. That is will.

Questioner: You used the word lower (life), and that brings the question about higher (aspects of life). I'm intrigued by the word lower. I'm more interested, of course, in the higher, but what can you...

MR. NYLAND: I think there are many different layers of lower. You know, if you look at man and you compare him as perhaps an animal, or in an animalistic state and gradually developing in what we might call either conscious or whatever are his essentialities as a man, I think a person goes through all different layers of existence. And we simply say he is at a lower level or at a higher level, dependent entirely where I am. If I look at someone, I say he is lower than I am, I criticize him and I think that the way he spends his energy is not worthwhile, but I spend my energy because I happen to (repeat it), and I love Buddha and all the kinds of philosophers. I'm a scientific man, and I'm engaged in research for the good benefit of mankind, and every once in a while I'm religious because I pay a hundred dollars to God in church, or whatever it may be. Whatever opinion I have of how I spend my time, I look at someone else and say, Look

at him, he's interested in TV. You know (that's you).

Questioner: I don't mean how people represent themselves, yes, I understand that. But in your research, though, have...

MR. NYLAND: No, I mean that a person goes through different layers in his own development, you see. And you compare it to someone else in order to indicate that you have a certain level. So for that you have to have a measure. So the question for oneself: What do I consider for myself in my life a high or a lower level? I think a higher level for me is the expenditure of energies which are linked up with the possibility of growth. That I think is a high level. When I become interested in evolution or in putting into actuality that what is potential, it is a very worthwhile purpose. You see, but for me it would be lower if I just maintained myself on the level where I am. So the indication of a higher level means I have to have aspiration. That is one. I also know that it has to change into an inner state which I call inspiration. And that state can change over into a state of devotion, or a state in which I'm willing to be bound or willing to sacrifice, or willing to gain something that has value for me which I don't possess. And therefore the height of the level where I am is indicated by my wish to reach a still higher level than where I am now.

So if I consider that what I am now, certain finite forms in which I'm bound by whatever form, whatever time, whatever elements there are of certain dimensional qualities, then I say that what is ultimate for me is to have entire freedom which I can only indicate by the word infinity. So between that what is now infinity and in the sense absolute, that that what I am now, temporary, I would like to become permanent. You see, if I say that I am all the time that what I am, I reach a state of being where nothing will disturb me. And philosophically speaking, I would say that's a higher state. The question is, what can I, as a man, do on Earth, and what is an

aim for me as man? And many times I will express it in a certain terminology, and I say I give to the poor, and therefore I am living on a higher level.

Questioner: What is it that you don't want disturbed? Because I would imagine there would be certain areas that would be disturbed but that's related to growth. But there is a certain something that you say you don't want disturbed.

MR. MYLAND: I don't want to disturb that what I consider already having characteristics closer to infinity. I don't want to disturb that what is the content of the form. You see? I consider that what is form temporary, and I would like to have different kinds of forms which will enable that what is inside to be more free to act. So if it is a concept of life in man and he is then in the form of his body, I would like to change the form of the body into that what I call then more ethereal or spiritual, so that that what is the reality of his life has more chance to exist. It depends entirely on the kind of concept that one has of life, but I feel that man is bound, and that what is alive in him is his reality.

Yah. You know?

Questioner: Man is ( ) bound?

MR. MYLAND: That's right. And therefore the ultimate aim for man would be to be free.

Questioner: That doesn't include trips known in the spiritual sense, like astral traveling?

MR. MYLAND: Oh, I think it is quite right, if you can return. You see, and that also if the taste of that experience is such I would like to have it in daily life.

Questioner: Well, I mean if you return - what if you could return to anything else that you wanted to. You could go, leave your body and from then become something else. It's not science fiction in that way.

MR. HYLAND: It doesn't help me when someone steps on my toes.

Questioner: I believe that it can help. Sometimes...

MR. HYLAND: Have you tried it?

Questioner: Well, I've had my toes stepped on, I imagine, yes.

MR. HYLAND: And at that time I usually say - if I come out of church and I've been very religious and I was in contact with God and I even sang, maybe, and I go outside the door and someone steps on my toes - I will say damn.

Questioner: No, I don't. I don't.

MR. HYLAND: You don't?

Questioner: No.

MR. HYLAND: I hope they will step on your toes sometime.

Questioner: Why? No, wait, you see, the point is, the person steps on my toes quite by accident, they don't even know who I am, if I'm there.

MR. HYLAND: No, that's right. You can be detached at the present time.

Questioner: Yes. Now they've stepped on my toes without knowing that they're...

MR. HYLAND: That's okay. You've explained it.

Questioner: Yeah.

MR. HYLAND: I can rationalize about it also. That's not the point. If I know by experience that that happened to me - someone makes a remark, You're a liar. And I say, What? I'm affected.

Questioner: But you're not a liar. You're not.

MR. HYLAND: Never mind, he says I am. You think I'm free from his statement?

Questioner: No, you're not.

MR. HYLAND: Not at all, not at all. I will call him a liar because he calls me a liar. But I have an argument.

Questioner: Yes, that's what I mean. Then what?

MR. HYLAND: Then what? I have an argument, I lose energy. I hope that something is in me that is not that touched by that kind of a statement.

Questioner: And if that were developed and he were to call you a liar, then what?

MR. HYLAND: Yah. Then I would say, Really?

Questioner: That's what I mean. That's what I mean. That's the same thing with the stepping on the toes.

MR. HYLAND: That's right.

Questioner: Really?

MR. HYLAND: Yes. That's right. If I can do that, fine. Now the question is, can you do it? You see?

Questioner: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: Good. You know what I mean.

Questioner: Yeah.

MR. HYLAND: It's quite a rationalization whenever you think about it, I should not have said this and that and so forth, it's too late. This whole thing is based on the practical experience and honesty of what one has experienced, not afterwards thinking about it and rationalizing and saying, I should not, because as soon as I say should, of course it means that I have not done it.

Questioner: Well, do you talk about techniques and exercises for one to develop that?

MR. HYLAND: Oh, yes, we talk about the preference that I would have if such a thing could be accomplished.

Yah.

Sixth Questioner: I think I know what regret means but I really don't know what remorse is.

MR. HYLAND: You don't know about what?

Questioner: Remorse.

MR. NYLAND: You don't know what remorse means? Why do you want to know?

Questioner: I've been pondering it.

MR. NYLAND: When you read about remorse of conscience, you have to have a conscience. Don't think about these things. It's very useless. Someone else may have remorse and of course there are descriptions every once in a while in certain stories about a person who is remorseful, and the remorse can be such that he would kill himself. But what really is it of concern of yours? Without any question it's much worse than regret. If you know what regret is, sometimes you know you are regretful that you have said certain things you should not have said. Remorse is much worse.

Remorse is an emotional quality in which the totality of myself is suffering so much that I do not see the end, and I don't believe there is an end. That's a state of remorse. Regret - sorry - is quite superficial compared to remorse. Remorse is the end of my life, that I do not know, although I know I'm alive, I don't know what to do with it. But I wouldn't think too much about it. Try to think only about that what is your experience. And all the rest becomes theory which is nice every once in a while to read about and perhaps a little bit to think. You know, if I've never been in Moscow, I can imagine to be there and I would like to be there because it would be so nice and I've seen pictures of it, and I would like to verify them. I have a feeling what it is to be there. And still I don't do it unless I feel that it is really necessary that I go. If I think it's necessary to have a state of remorse I will try to do certain things that actually would make me remorseful, if I think it is necessary for my education as a whole. And as long as I feel that there is enough to be educated by and it doesn't include remorse, I leave it alone.

You understand what I mean?

Yah.

Arty Dann: So often I think I know why I want to Work or I think I know what I should do, and sometimes I even attempt to carry out these tasks. But inevitably I fail and ask myself why I want to Work. And I can only come up with very abstract answers because my experience is so limited. And sometimes I even ask myself why I must be objective, why I must Work, and I really know inside me that I must but yet when I ask myself...

MR. NYLAND: How do you know that? How do you know that you must? What is that inside you that tells you that?

Arty: Perhaps more than anything, faith in the (teaching).

MR. NYLAND: It's quite possible. You see, but then at times when you don't want to Work, or you question yourself, that particular statement is not very strong. You might say both are a little theoretical because you do not experience them. The question of motivation, why one is interested in Work, it has to be very clear for oneself that that is a motivation which all the time is there and not every once in a while.

So I think it's important to find out what it is, and you say inside, I must Work. You say it is faith. Yes, I have something that I want to know because I know it ought to lead me somewhere else. If that's the case, then I know that where I am now is not entirely satisfactory. Then I try to define what is not satisfactory about my present condition. When, a little while ago, we said a person who is happy and so forth - there are no problems and they hope that they never will have any. So that life, you might say, has been good to them, they haven't suffered very much. They have not been in contact with suffering, or if they were, they've turned their back towards it, and I don't want anything of that. I think there are a few fortunate

people who happen to exist without being touched by the burden. But I think that most of us, surely at the end of a day that may have been quite disappointing, will start to ask, Why is it that so-and-so was such and such to me? Or why was it that I couldn't convince someone that I wanted a job, that I couldn't get it? Or why was it that I at school only got a D and I thought I deserved at least B plus.

The conditions in which one is during daily life, and particularly in the evening when you look at yourself, how you have behaved - sometimes it's quite incomprehensible why you did what you did or what you said or what you felt. And you know well enough that every time when you come to that kind of a conclusion, that perhaps you don't like yourself well enough, or maybe that you wished you could have been different. It is based on these kind of problems that I say I should have been different and I am not. And what's the reason that I can not be different? So next time I say I will do it better or differently. The next time comes around and apparently I react in very much the same way, and again I come to the conclusion that I was a stupid fool. I couldn't do anything about it, or that I start to excuse it, or I explain it, or I rationalise and I say that happens to be my condition, or sometimes it is my nature and therefore I let it go. Whenever I'm satisfied with all the different conditions which in the beginning affect me a little bit adversely, and where I feel that it is not right and so forth, and I should not be the person to suffer that much, if I can rationalise sufficiently, I will forget, and time will heal all such wounds, and after some time I've almost forgotten.

The question is always, when I'm interested in this kind of a possibility of a development, on what do I want to base it? And it is obvious that that what I am now is not as yet sufficiently complete. And that what I realise I am, I think could be improved. Or rather that I see that there are many

things that are wrong with me when I believe that I lose energies or that I have not enough control, or that sometimes I'm completely at a loss to know what to do, that at times I get stuck in my mind and it keeps on churning around. And that sometimes I spend energy in having feelings about a lot of things that're none of my business. Or that someone argues with me and I cannot convince him, and still I know that I'm right, but he convinces me because he is more clever. Whatever the motivations are, determine in you at the present time what you wish to be. And to what extent that now is, you might say, strong enough to overcome other conditions in which you try to explain yourself, that you still want to hold on to something that will give you more desire to live or more guidance in your life, or more solidity for yourself to be able to stand on.

These are the questions you must think about. You say, Yes, I ought to Work. Why really? For what? For this Earth? Why should I be conscious on Earth? I can imagine my unconscious state to be sufficiently clever, to be quite clear, to have ability, physically, to be able emotionally to express myself, to have art, creation for me, for this life, to have admiration, respect; to have a family, to have children, to educate them; to have a name in this world and be paid in accordance with it; to receive publicity, to have vanity stroked. Whatever it is that I set up as something that I would like to have, after a little while I probably can get it, in this life. But you see, the basis for that is that I assume that this life is all there is to it. And that sometimes is a thought that I don't like, because here I spend all kind of energies in trying to improve myself and then I die and then of course I say, What happened? All the energy that I've spent in building myself up to become a better kind of a man, for what? I can always say for my own glorification, or for my pleasure; or that is what life has meant to me, that I've utilized it to the best of my advantage,

even that I was considered in my own age a nice, kind man with enough interest in ordinary life, and giving enough to my children or to other people, and dividing whatever millions I've made during my lifetime. And with that, maybe, I can fall asleep and die quite easily.

It depends entirely on how one considers one's life to be. And if that what is life as manifestation, that what is body, that what is brain in order to guide you across the street and not get run over by the car, or to have enough feeling to be nice and kind to other people, every once in a while to love them. Or to hate a little bit, but not too much. And whatever it is. But is it all there is to man? Is man worth more than that? And is he at certain times quite aware of the fact that something exists in him which is not so easily expressed in the terminology of ordinary manifestations? With other words, one says, do I consist of that what I now represent as life in my manifestations as a personality, or is there something that I would call of etheresl or spiritual value? And sometimes the question of religion of course will come up. Do I assume that that what is life in me and life in other people - I'm interested to know does it exist on Mars. Is it as a total appearance in all kind of forms in the rest of the universe? Is there a reason why the universe is the way it is, the way I look at it? And the way the different constellations, so-called, are put together in accordance with certain laws - can I count on them? And they can predict when there is a sun eclipse or whatever may be. And then I say, is there intelligence? What form is such intelligence? And then I, with my ordinary intelligence, try to think about what is above me at a higher level which has that kind of a superior intelligence. Then I say, is there a God or not? And if He is, why isn't He here now? Or what is it in me that can associate with Him, or to what extent would He be interested in me? In that what I am, am I in such a way that He could become interested? Or is it

really affrontery that I think, or assumption that He ought to be interested in me - and what am I?

You see, all of this belongs to motivation for a wish to Work, because the wish to Work must be based on something that I realise that what I am is not as yet sufficiently complete. And if I use a general term of trying to become a harmonious man, I will try to describe it in such a way that I say that what is harmonious for me is a man who, in any kind of a condition, can act and think and feel in the way a real man ought to be. And that at such a time that what he is as a man, he can face any condition of life, or even any form of life in the way it ought to be faced. In other words, you see, I try to indicate for myself what is a concept of omniscience, or omnipotence or omnipresence - three attributes that I say belong to God. And what is God for me? And what is within me that I call godlike? And such problems. Is man actually a division or made up of two kind of things: one of a material form, the other of a spiritual kind, a third of concepts, of abstract forms, of magnetism, attractions, of that what may be electronically defined and still have, you might say, the particular possibility of being like X rays, free from that what is matter and so forth, whatever it may be.

Try to become clearer about what you really want. What is it you want to develop? If there is something in you that is now potential, why would you want to make it actual? And if it is potential, of what value is it? Life is not only of this Earth, although we are. And there are problems of Earth which have to be settled, but man doesn't live by bread alone. He has to have something that also satisfies him and particularly when he tries to live the way his life could be, in the best way he can when intellectually he knows that something has to be done or accomplished intellectually. And that emotionally, something has to be established as a relationship between that what he is as man and something that exists in the outside world and

extending it as far as infinity. What is one's place when at the end of the day you consider and you say, Yes, I wish to Work. And again, for what? For the immediate use in daily life, or for something that religiously we call the building of the possibility of permanency in the form of a Soul? Does man wish a Soul? Does he wish to continue to live after his physical body dies? What is this life that I now become aware of? What kind of value is it to me? Do I want to retain it, or can I, as I am now, give it up when I die?

I think these are problems, you see, that come up for every thinking person. And he has to come to some kind of conclusions regarding them because on that he will have to base his philosophy. And the determination for a man to say what are the aspects, what are the possibilities? What can he expect from life? What does he really want to reach? What is for him an ideal man? How does he describe when he grows up, that what he wishes to become, in what sense? To become real, what is again permanent in man that need not be destroyed?

What do you study?

Arty: What do I study? Gurdjieff and related writings.

MR. MYLAND: No, don't be narrow-minded and study Gurdjieff. The world is filled with a variety of different things. But you have to know what is right and what is wrong. Don't become fanatic. It is not--It is much too early. You've got to accumulate facts and facts about yourself as well as about other people. You cannot afford to withdraw from the world and following Gurdjieff. It's wonderful to do it, but it goes at the expense of a total development of yourself in which everything that is now as talents, or ambitions, or the things that are open for you and that you should pursue as an ordinary man. You should fulfill, otherwise you don't pay Mother Nature what is required by her. The fact that you're alive on Earth has a meaning.

It doesn't mean that you want to become an angel. I want to be a man on Earth, knowing which way to go. I want to be a man of this world. I want to know that is right and that is not right for me. This is what I wish for my development but I have to have a basis on which it can be built. I build a temple but it has to have a foundation, and the foundation is on Earth. That's where I happen to grow. It's not anywhere else. It's not in heaven. The roots are in Earth, now as a man, being born here, and I have to walk here, and that happens to be my fate. And like it or not, that's what I am. And I have to function normally, like ordinary human beings, unconsciously, for a little while, until after that I see that it is not always necessary to remain unconscious. And then I have facts to deal with, which can help me in building something by which I can then extract, from that what I have as experience, the things that are more permanent, and gradually distill out of my ordinary life the material for my conscious life. It's different.

Don't, don't get too narrow-minded. Gurdjieff isn't. When he writes ALL AND EVERYTHING, he means it. And how can you recognize certain things that are described when you don't know it yourself? Have all the friends in the world and talk about all kind of subjects that you happen to think about. If possible, experience as much as you possibly can experience. Do this, do that, do stupid nonsensical things. Don't get into trouble, that's all. Don't get too close to a policeman. And don't do foolish things for which you'll become a little responsible afterwards that you are sorry. Don't take on more than you can carry, don't take responsibilities hoping for the best. Use common sense. But live. All right?

Arty: Thank you.

MR. NYLAND: Yah.

Someone: May I be excused to go to the bathroom?

MR. NYLAND: Yah. We'll bring the bathroom here.

Yah.

Eighth Questioner: How can a man separate for himself, what is his essence from what is his personality?

MR. MYLAND: I don't think he can. I think there are certain qualities in man that are more essential than that what is superficial. If I try to find out what is really my essence, sometimes we call it like peeling an artichoke or an onion. I know that I will go to the kernal of that what is essential, but where I cross the line I really don't know. Where I come from, if I come from the surface, that what is back of me is always superficial. That what I face in front of me is always essential. And it doesn't matter at what place I am, that condition always remains. So that when I go towards the center, that what used to be essence becomes superficial. You see, I cannot divide, but I do know at certain times I'm more essential or I'm more superficial. And sometimes for certain conditions, it may be necessary to be superficial, and for other circumstances, it may be that I should be more essential. It's a question of expenditures of energy. If I'm the master of that what is me as having energy to spend, I will want to be efficient and I want to be honest, and I don't want to pay more than I have to. But I want to pay whatever is required. So if sometimes I pay in superficiality, if it serves the purpose, it's quite all right. I don't want to waste essential values. But when it's a question of reaching God, I know that I have to be much more essential and usually I am.

Sometimes I say it's a question of the herd. What makes a herd? Only one sheep. You start counting. If twenty is a herd, count down. One is not a herd, count up. There is always a point, you say, between eleven and twelve, one is a herd, one is not. That's the question of essence. I really don't know. In my being, there may be the difference between six and seven. In someone else's life, it may be between thirty and thirty-one. You see? My concept of the herd may be different from someone else. The concept of

my essence may be different from someone else. What I call essential may be quite superficial to someone else. Depends a little bit on the type, but for myself, I determine that what I now consider essential. After ten years, I may have changed my mind.

Yah? Not Patrick, not Peter. Yah. Yah, Mona.

Mona ( ): At what point - considering a person who wants very much to wake up and to Work on himself - at what point will God want to be interested in him?

MR. NYLAND: I don't know. You know, I don't know God. I don't think He's ever given a description of how a man should be so that he could recognise Him. I think partly it's heresay and partly it's assumption. And when I live with that for some time, there is going to be a conviction which becomes my own, in which then I start to judge about how I behave. And then I say this is the concept I have of God, this is the concept I have of myself. And I say now, if God would come and see me, would that what I am be acceptable to Him? So the question becomes a very personal one. I live and I say, that what I'm doing, is that becoming to man? Because when I'm a man, then God can recognise man. And many times I know that that what I'm doing is not fit to go through the eye of a needle.

You see, that determination, what is God, what is me, can He look at me, can I look at Him - it depends entirely what I consider God to be, and that what I am. To the extent that I wake up to myself, to that extent I will know more what I really am. To the same extent, I will know what God is. That what I try to uncover, in trying to become that what I am myself, will start to resemble that what is God. And that after some time, I come to the realisation that that what is permanent within me, as something that is undisturbed and will always be there, is really godlike in its nature. So if I wish to know what it is, acceptable to God, it would have to be

what is acceptable to that what is essentially essence. You see?

Yes, Patrick. Not on light and dark. Another question.

Patrick Conty: You said that there is a correspondence between outside and inside.

MR. HYLAND: Who said that?

Patrick: (Emerald Rule).

MR. HYLAND: Who?

Patrick: (Emerald Rule).

MR. HYLAND: Is it some person who wrote a book?

Patrick: ...

MR. HYLAND: I don't hear it.

Patrick: ( ) I don't know.

Ernie Haim: (Cabelo?)

Patrick: No, not (Pablo).

MR. HYLAND: Jean Marcott?

Patrick: It's a law which is in esoteric knowledge ( ), inside and outside.

MR. HYLAND: Macrocosmos and microcosmos? So above, so below? Yah, is that what you mean? Now we're on common ground. All right.

Patrick: It's a little bit...

MR. HYLAND: Yah, okay. For example.

Patrick: The Indians say that religion is our territory, is our land.

MR. HYLAND: Say it again.

Patrick: The Indians say that religion is our territory, is our land.

MR. HYLAND: Yah.

Patrick: So it is ( ). Can one ( ) New York? New York, it is modern. Can one make a correspondence to something else? Is there a correspondence ( ) group?

MR. HYLAND: Is there for you? Is New York your religion?

Patrick: No.

MR. HYLAND: All right. Then it doesn't help. Whatever an Indian has said about his land belonged to him. It does not belong to you. But it belongs to your thoughts if you would like to understand why he said it. So then you look for the meaning of that kind of a saying. What can he mean - it does not mean that it corresponds to your experience of New York. He means his land for him has the quality that it inspires him in his life to live in accordance with a religion. Now he populates his land with spiritual values. And that whenever he experiences, looking at his land - and wherever he may be, in Dakota or in Nevada - that that gives him his religion because he links it up with that what is his spiritual world. And he assumes that those spirits and whatever it is that belongs to his religion, are living somewhere in the mountain. And when he sees them - and the mountain represents something that looks even like some kind of an image which appeals to him - he becomes spiritual. It's quite a different thing. It depends on his state and that what he then endows the outside world to be. But again it requires a translation in such a man, of that what is his inner life into that what is the outside appearance.

And when one says macrocosmos and microcosmos, man is always in between with the realization of that what is macro- for him and what is micro- for him. He is in between that. That what is micro- for him is, let's say, the structure of the atom. That what is macro- for him is the rest of the universe as far as he can understand. And now man, as in between, is the conversion agent between the principles which belong to the macro- as well as the micro-. And he starts to define them in his own terminology, and then has to apply the laws of relativity, belongs to a higher level and a lower level in which he finds himself in between the two, and starts to

realize that he has contact with above and contact with below which, for him then, becomes truth.

You cannot eliminate a person's own experiences, his thoughts and his feeling, whenever he starts to consider anything of the outside world, above or below. But that what determines his state is he himself, in which he uses all the different influences, wherever they come from, to be digested by himself so that he, in himself, becomes his own little kingdom or his own solar system. Then he can apply that what belongs to the outside world in terminology of his own.

Patrick: (What about magic?) If it exists (as) magic.

MR. HYLAND: I don't know. There is nothing else to imagine.

Patrick: I don't say imagine. The magic.

MR. HYLAND: The magic is always something that is mysterious. Find out what the magic is and live in accordance with it if you can. If magic is still a symbol, try to understand the symbol. And you will only know what it is when you apply it and have experience based on it. Otherwise it stays outside, Patrick. It's lovely for your mind and sometimes, in the present, it's like a colored glass in a church.

What is it for me when I have to buy bread, when I have to go to a grocery store, when I have to educate my children, when I have to do work that I don't like, when I have to find a job in order to earn money? In ordinary relations with ordinary people, what is it that I can have now that will enable me to behave as I should behave? Those are the considerations. I'm not interested in the rest, than only to stimulate me in order to be able to live. The emphasis of life is on life as I live it, not what other people think, not what happens in the rest of the world. It's only good for a little while and sometimes it gives me a taste. And sometimes it acts on me like salt, for the meal which I eat and which I prepare, which I cook,

and which I digest. That's my diet. And I allow, at times, God to come and to put a little sauce on, when I ask Him.

Don't lose yourself too much in all kind of theoretical - I wouldn't call it nonsense. I call it still stimulating. Don't pay attention to it too much. Your daily life is the thing that counts. How you drink coffee, how you are with people, where you lose yourself, where everything goes into the gutter, where you are completely at a loss for yourself, not knowing what to do. And when you're not happy when you get up in the morning because you have to suffer and suffer, and you cannot do what you really wish to do. That's important. To have lunch and to sit about certain things and talk, and then to get from it information, stimulus, so that this afternoon is a different afternoon. Not just wishy-washy, a little bit of nonsense that we talk about, your life when you're out in the street, when you meet so-and-so, how to behave, what to be. To find yourself in your daily life, and to see what you are and to be honest. That's the purpose of this kind of a lunch: to become serious about one's life. Never mind the Indian. He'll find his way, if he isn't there already.

So we'll see each other - no, next week, Tom Rosers will take my place. I'll be in Boston again. So you come and you talk, and you make a tape. I can listen to it. Then I can profit by it because I know where you are. And maybe we can talk about a few things of that kind. After that, that is, two weeks from today, I hope I'll still be here. I'm not quite certain. But anyhow I will let you know.

So goodbye. See you.

END TAPE

Transcribed: Arty Dann
Proofed: Jessica Haim
Final Type: Lenore Beach